

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the courtesy and effort extended by the Examiner in conducting a telephone interview with their attorney, Richard J. Katz, on April 8, 2005. The Interview discussion topic was the disposition of claims 5 and 13 in light of the Amendment Accompanying an RCE, filed September 20, 2004. The Examiner indicated during the Interview that the Office Action Summary should indicate that the disposition of claims 5 and 13 is “allowed” and not “objected to.”

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 17 and 18 have been added. No new matter is added.

Amendments to claims 3-5, 7-8, 11 and 13 were made to more distinctly claim the subject matter recited therein, and are of an idiomatic nature. Therefore, there is no narrowing of the subject matter contained therein.

Allowable Subject Matter

that Izumi does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 9. Thus, Izumi does not anticipate the invention of claims 1 and 9.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 9. Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 are patentable over Izumi for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,249 to Evanicky et al. ("Evanicky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner acknowledges that Izumi does not disclose that a parameter includes information used for tone reproduction curve correction or a white balance adjustment. The Examiner cites Evanicky as disclosing "a tone reproduction curve correction and a white balance adjustment upon receiving a light-sensing signal from a light sending device." (Detailed Office Action, item 5, page 4.) The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Izumi and Evanicky to achieve the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that the combination of Izumi and Evanicky neither discloses nor suggests, singly or in combination, the feature "the parameter participating in picture quality

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated March 9, 2005 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: June 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant